



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,251	08/05/2005	Richard Perrin	M0025.0319/P319	3630
24998 7590 10/14/2008 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 1825 EYE STREET NW Washington, DC 20006-5403				
EXAMINER KOSANOVIC, HELENA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3749				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/525,251	PERRIN, RICHARD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	HELENA KOSANOVIC	3749	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) HELENA KOSANOVIC. (3) Steve McAllister.  
 (2) Stephen Soffen. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 September 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 44, 66, 69 and 72.

Identification of prior art discussed: Magill 4,184,288.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives contacted the examiner to discuss the merits of the Final Office Action, mailed 6/12/2008. Differences between the claimed invention and the prior art of record were discussed. In particular there was discussion about defining internal inner surface of the wall of the ducting in order to overcome the Magill reference in the Final Office Action. It was determined that amending the claim language to clarify the meaning of "inner" would define over the existing rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Steven B. McAllister/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3749